



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Classical Philology

VOL. I

April, 1906

NO. 2

THE *DE ANALOGIA* OF JULIUS CAESAR; ITS OCCASION, NATURE, AND DATE, WITH ADDITIONAL FRAGMENTS

BY G. L. HENDRICKSON

It is customary to say that Cicero's treatise *De oratore* reveals no trace of that controversy with the school of contemporary purists—whom without further definition and for brevity's sake we may designate as Atticists—which is in so large a measure the animating element of the two later works of the rhetorical trilogy, the *Brutus* and the *Orator*.¹ The absence of such allusion has been used as a criterion for determining the chronological relationships of Atticism at Rome, for interpreting the purpose and tendency of the *De oratore* itself, and in general it has played a considerable rôle in the study of the literary history of the time. It is not my purpose to question the validity of this conclusion directly, but rather to show that at least one of the important contributions to the movement, the treatise of Julius Caesar *De analogia*, owed its origin to certain utterances contained in the third book *De oratore*, relative to the importance of and the means

¹O. Harnacker *Jahrb. f. Phil.* CXXV (1882), p. 607: "Zunächst ist ausserordentlich bemerkenswert, dass die Bücher vom Redner noch gar keine Spur eines solchen Streites zeigen." Schanz *Röm. Lit.* I², p. 240: "(Diese Opposition) war noch nicht erstarkt als Cicero im J. 55 seine Schrift über den Redner schrieb; denn hier geschieht dieser jungattischen Bestrebungen keine Erwähnung." Hirzel *Der Dialog* I, p. 483. 1: "Zwar von dem Streite Ciceros mit den Atticisten ist in de oratore kaum etwas zu merken." Cf. also Norden I, p. 224 extr., and Landgraf *De Ciceronis elocutione*, etc. (Würzburg 1878), p. 7 note.

of attaining to a pure Latinity. That the words of Cicero which challenged Caesar to a reply were in turn directed against earlier theorists, holding a position exactly analogous to Caesar's, would be my justification for contending that the ranks of the Atticists (though the name had not yet come into vogue) and of their rhetorical opponents were already sharply arrayed when the *De oratore* was written.

The emergence of the question from the shadow of scholastic debate into the light of public discussion was, I suspect, largely due to the heavy weight of authority and persuasiveness which Cicero threw into one side of the scale by the treatise *De oratore*. For as it can be made probable, I think, that Cicero's utterances elicited Caesar's work, so it is likely that a fuller record of the time would reveal his influence upon the contributions to this controversy which were made by others. For though there is certainly but little in the *De oratore* which can be conceived of as directed immediately against the position of the Atticists, yet the significance of the treatise as a polemical document lies rather on the positive side, in the vigor and fulness with which it elaborates an ideal of rhetorical abundance and embellishment which was wholly opposed to the qualities of conversational simplicity and idiomatic purity which the Atticists cherished. But in order to understand the points of view from which the work must have given offense to the purists, and from which it elicited Caesar's protest, it will be necessary to outline briefly something of the earlier history of the grammatical-rhetorical tendencies which reached their first culmination in the Roman Atticism of Cicero's time.

Atticism as the designation of a grammatical-rhetorical ideal was merely a narrower limitation and sharper definition of the older term Hellenism. The pursuit of Hellenism as a goal of special stylistic effort belongs naturally to the time when the Attic dialect was becoming the recognized *κοινή* of the Hellenic world, and when therefore corruption from foreign and dialectical sources could be judged and checked by reference to a certain standard. Ἑλλητισμός is not found in the lists of stylistic virtues which have come down to us from the earlier rhetorical sources.

The treatise of Demetrius *De elocutione* which has drawn so largely from early Peripatetic sources is silent on this point, and furthermore it is expressly attested by late rhetorical treatises that Hellenism was a subsequent addition to the earlier lists of qualities of style.¹ The earliest technical allusion to it is found nevertheless in Aristotle (*Rhet.* iii. 5 init.): ἔστι ἀρχὴ τῆς λέξεως τὸ ἐλληνίζειν. Here, however, as the succeeding context shows, ἐλληνίζειν is syntactical congruence of a simple type, and not the painstaking care in the choice of words and in the observance of correct grammatical forms, by which the developed cult of Hellenism strove to maintain the traditions of the past and stem the tide of barbarous innovation.

The definite recognition of Hellenism as the goal of stylistic effort comes characteristically from the Stoics. Their doctrines of style were an outgrowth of their logic. Thought and language were merely two manifestations of the same thing—λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός. Correctness of speech was necessary to accuracy of thought. Their stylistic principles were essentially a specific definition of the Peripatetic λόγος πρὸς τὰ πράγματα.² They asked for nothing more than a correct and pure use of the mother-tongue—Ἑλληνισμός. This was their goal and the superior caption to which they subordinated all particular virtues of style and all warnings against error.³ The Stoics, as is well known, are the essential creators of grammar, in the sense at least that they reduced to system the scattered speculations of earlier philosophers and observers. Grammar early became a power which rhetoric could not ignore, but the two subjects were essentially antipathetic. Grammar inherited from its parent, philosophy, a traditional hostility to rhetoric, and found rhetorical exuberance

¹ Tzetzes *Chiliad.* xi. 369 (after naming four virtues of narrative: σαφές, μεγαλοπρέπεια, συντομία, πιθανόν): Ἑλληνισμὸν οἱ νέοι δὲ φάσκουσι τῶν ῥητόρων | οὐχὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν κατὰ τῶν πρὶν ῥητόρων; and Georg. Pletho VI. 588 (Walz): ὁ τῶν ὀνομάτων γὰρ Ἑλληνισμὸς νεωτερικὸν ἔστιν. Cf. also Walz II. 14. 21.

² See the writer's article on the "Origin and Meaning of the Ancient Characters of Style" in the *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXVI (1905), p. 259.

³ In the statement of their doctrines in Diogenes Laertius VII. 59, Ἑλληνισμός is designated as φράσις (Graeci φράσιν vocant, Latine dicimus elocutionem. Quint. viii. 1. 1; and x. i. 87: phrasin, id est corpus eloquentiae), while the other virtues of style are called λέξεις.

of diction, metaphor, and rhythm constantly at variance with the simpler standards of correctness and idiomatic purity, to the attainment of which Hellenism looked.

In the earlier stages of this pursuit stylistic effort did not go beyond the avoidance of the more conspicuous barbarisms of the *κοινή*, with acceptance of the corresponding Attic usage. But as this common dialect was recognized as having its origin in Attic, so by degrees exclusively Attic usage came to be looked upon as the norm of Hellenism. Finally, by a gradual and perhaps imperceptible development, Atticism became frankly recognized as the goal of practical grammatical study. But this was no new nor radical point of view, and the old term *Ἑλληνισμός* for the most part still continued to do duty when it had become pure Atticism. For Hellenism in prose had always been Atticistic—and could not, indeed, have been otherwise; and frankly avowed Atticism was only the final step in a tendency which was as old as the study of Hellenism.

The earliest coherent record of the stylistic doctrines of the Stoics (Diog. Laert. vii. 59) is traceable with much certainty to Diogenes of Babylon, who was a member of the embassy of Attic philosophers which visited Rome in the year 155. Diogenes was at this time an old man, but more than a decade earlier his pupil, Crates of Mallos, the Pergamene grammarian, had, as Suetonius tells us, introduced at Rome the comprehensive literary studies which were embraced under the name of grammar. Suetonius only speaks of the critical and exegetical studies of Crates, but it can not be doubted that he devoted attention to grammar in the narrower sense, the goal of which was the determination of Hellenism. It is this aspect of grammar to which I shall here confine attention—*ἡ γραμματικὴ περὶ τὸν Ἑλληνισμόν*.

The Latin equivalent of *Ἑλληνισμός* is *Latinitas*, *Latine loqui*. As *Ἑλληνισμός* in the definition of Diogenes is *φράσις ἀδιάπτωτος*, so *Latinitas* is *sermo purus, ab omni vitio remotus* (Auct. *Ad Her.* iv. 12. 17). How early the conception appears in Roman literature it is difficult to say; but the Scipionic circle was throughout under the influence of Stoic teachers, from whom they derived their general attitude toward style—their sobriety and restraint,

and their aversion to rhetorical exuberance. From this source too they derived the impulse to cultivate and maintain (against the excesses of rhetorical experiment and innovation) the purity of the native conversational idiom. With them *Latine loqui* was the term of highest literary praise, and such a predicate concerning L. Furius Philus, the young friend of Laelius, Cicero reports in the *Brutus* (108): *perbene Latine loqui putabatur litteratiusque quam ceteri*. In this circle condemnatory judgments were passed upon the popular literary favorites of the time (as the fragments of Lucilius reveal), and it is probable that the judgments concerning the impurity of the language of Caecilius and Pacuvius¹ go back to relatively early criticism from such sources.

As in Greek the norm of Hellenism was sought in the older language—Homer and the early Atthis—so in Rome Plautus, Naevius, Cato (to whom were soon added Terence, Laelius, and Scipio Africanus) were early set up as the purest sources of *Latinitas*. In general, the theoretical studies at Rome in this field were closely modeled upon the contemporary Greek studies which looked to Ἑλληνισμός as their goal. This led by the beginning of the first century to the transference to Rome and to the Latin language of the prolific controversy concerning analogy and anomaly, both of which aimed by different methods to arrive at a more secure and certain determination of correct usage—Ἑλληνισμός or *Latinitas*.² Since the study of Hellenism had

¹ Male locutos esse, mali auctores Latinitatis (*Brutus* 258 and *Ad Att.* vii. 3. 16). Cf. Reitzenstein *M. Terentius Varro* etc. (Leipzig, 1901), p. 90; Büttner *Porc. Lic.*, p. 59.

² The connection of analogical studies in grammar with Atticism was suggested by Mommsen (*Röm. Gesch.* III⁶, 579), and has recently been set forth in more detail by Norden (*Ant. Kunstpr.* I. 184). Since then the matter has been touched upon by several scholars, some of whom seem to have drawn the erroneous conclusion that the Atticists, *qua Attici*, were necessarily analogists. This is of course far from being the case, and W. Schmid (*Berl. phil. Woch.* 1904, 429) has pointed out instances in which the analogical forms of words were found in the *κοινή*, while the corresponding Attic forms were anomalous. But such observations should not, on the other hand, lead to any identification of Atticism and anomaly. The truth is that all grammar, whether guided by the principle of analogy or depending upon observation of early usage (anomaly), was Atticistic, looking to the determination of a pure and pristine Hellenism. Analogy and anomaly, or any other conceivable points of view, were merely methods for attaining to a common goal. Cf. Probus *Instituta artium* (*G. L.* IV, p. 47): nunc huius artis, id est grammaticae, omnis dumtaxat Latinitas ex duabus

been developed especially by the Stoics, and in the first instance as an instrument of more precise logical discussion, it was definitely anti-rhetorical, with consequent recognition of the conversational idiom as the only true and natural form of speech. Similarly *Latinitas* always has as its equivalent *Latine loqui*, not *Latine dicere*; it is *sermo*, not *contentio*.¹

Coming at length to Caesar, it is generally conceded that he is to be grouped with the Roman Atticists. His writing reveals a certain stylistic Atticism discernible in the reproduction of some features of the style of Xenophon.² The characteristic feature of his Latinity is a painstaking correctness or elegance,³ in accordance with a much severer norm of idiomatic purity (*urbanitas*) than Cicero anywhere reveals.⁴ This affected not only forms (avoidance of barbarism) and syntax (avoidance of solecism), but also appropriateness and idiomatic purity in the choice of words (*πρέπον* and *κυριολογία*). Conversational tone (*loqui*, not *dicere*) and pragmatic objectivity are the general effects sought, with consequent avoidance of manifest rhetorical art. In all this Caesar's style agrees with what we learn from other sources of the small group who called themselves Atticists. Their stylistic code in a word was an effective and elegant use of the conversational language, with the aim of attaining such results in Latin as were exemplified by certain Greek writers who were held to have realized this ideal—Xenophon, Lysias, Hyperides. Of those

partibus constat, hoc est ex analogia et anomalia. The position is sound, but only intelligible in the impartial perspective of sufficient remoteness from the warfare of the two principles, when the truth of both could be accepted without partisan adherence to the one or the other.

¹ One of the earliest definitions of grammar is that of Demetrius Chlorus (ca. 100 B. C.): γραμματική ἐστὶ τέχνη τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν συνήθειαν λέξεων ἐδοξίς (Sext. Emp. *Adv. gram.* 84).

² Xenophon had long served as a model of simple, non-rhetorical style in the school of Roman purists, whose continuity is unbroken from the time of the Scipionic group, through the circles influenced by Q. Lutatius Catulus, down to Caesar himself. The devotion of Scipio to the works of Xenophon is recorded in a well-known utterance of Cicero (*Ad Q. frat.* i. 1. 23). Catulus was one of the precursors of Caesar in the literature of personal memoirs, and from Cicero (*Brutus* 132) we learn that his work *De consulatu et de rebus gestis suis* was written *mollis et Xenophontio genere sermonis*. For the influence which the circle of Catulus exercised upon Caesar, see p. 111.

³ See the definition of *elegantia* cited on p. 105.

⁴ See O. Weise *Charakteristik d. lat. Sprache*, 3d ed. (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 135 ff.

whom we know to have been called Atticists no sufficient examples of style have survived, but we may believe with some confidence that Caesar's commentaries for prose, and Catullus' poems for verse, are, essentially speaking, products of this stylistic effort. It was a creed of style not less difficult of realization than avowed rhetorical art—perhaps more difficult, and the painstaking labor which was bestowed upon niceties of purity, elegance, and simplicity is set forth in not a few of the characterizations of representatives of this school. Quintilian, reflecting the hostility with which the rhetorician always contemplated the pedantry of such effort, speaks of those *quos curiose potius loqui dixeris quam Latine* (viii. 1. 2), and he tells the story of Theophrastus' discomfiture on the detection of his foreign birth by the market-woman *quod nimium Attice loqueretur*. In the same category of supersensitiveness he places Asinius Pollio's detection of *Patavinitas* in the language of Livy. It is from this point of view that Cicero's characterization of Calvus is to be understood, who (he says) by too diligent self-scrutiny and castigation lost true vitality in the effort to avoid possible reproach of error. His language in consequence was attenuated by an excessive scrupulosity (*nimia religione attenuata*), and in the same sense Fronto speaks of the grammatical treatise of Caesar as *libri scrupulosis-simi*.¹ The epithets of praise which the Atticists strove to earn were *expolitio, urbanitas, elegantia* (*Brutus* 285). They sought not so much for the merit of positive excellence as for the praise of avoidance of error in reproducing the habit of urbane conversational speech. The Stoic definition of 'Ελληνισμός is φράσις ἀδιάπτωτος ἐν τῇ τεχνικῇ συνηθείᾳ. Similarly *Latinitas* in the rendering of the Auctor *Ad Herennium* is *sermo . . . ab omni vitio remotus*, in the light of which Cicero's words concerning Calvus (*Brutus* 283) are to be understood: *metuens ne vitiosa colligeret, verum sanguinem deperdebat*.² The matter admits

¹ Compare the characterization of Caesar's language by Gellius xix. 8. 3: *Sermonis praeter alios suae aetatis castissimi*, and Quintilian concerning Calvus, x. i. 115: *sed est et sancta et gravis oratio et castigata*.

² Cf. Quint. viii. 1. 2: *sed ea quae de ratione Latine atque emendate loquendi fuerunt dicenda, in libro primo . . . exsecuti sumus, verum illic tantum, ne vitiosa essent, praecipimus*. Cf. Zonaras (cited by Lehrs *Herod.*, p. 390): *τέλος δὲ γραμματικῆς*

of much fuller illustration, but for the present let this suffice to outline the grammatical doctrines and stylistic tendencies, which, with *Latine loqui* as their supreme goal, stood at this time in more or less conscious antithesis to rhetorical ideals of an abundant and embellished style.

We have seen that Atticism among the Greeks was an extreme form of the grammatical cult of Hellenism. The studies begun by the Greeks were transferred to Rome and the Latin tongue, and here toward the middle of the first century B. C. the name "Atticism" was adopted by certain extremists, doubtless from the usage of contemporary Greek purists, for these studies in their application to Latin. Cicero's words¹ would suggest that Calvus was the first (Roman) to apply the name to himself; but, however that may have been, he possessed sufficient leadership to muster a school of followers under this new and modish title. But they stood for the same stylistic ideals and for the same studies which before their time, and side by side with them, were pursued under the name of *Latinitas*. Nor did the name apparently long survive at Rome, and it is, I suspect, to the breaking up and disappearance of this particular coterie of Attici (which followed on the death of Calvus) that Cicero alludes in *Tusc.* ii. 3: *genus Atticorum . . . qui iam conticuerunt paene ab ipso foro inrisci*. But the cult of a refined and elegant Latinity continued to be observed in the same spirit as that of Calvus and his friends, and it was represented in the succeeding period most conspicuously by Asinius Pollio and Messala Corvinus, by Horace and Virgil (in their earlier work), and indeed by most of the poets of the circles of Maecenas and Messala.²

τὸ μηδέποτε ἀμαρτάνειν μήτε περὶ μίαν λέξιν μήτε περὶ πλείονας. To the grammatical studies of Calvus Cicero alludes, in passing judgment on his style, in *Fam.* xv. 21. 7: *multae erant et reconditae litterae, vis non erat*. With this compare *Brutus* 252 (concerning Caesar): *ut esset perfecta illa bene loquendi laus, multis litteris et eis quidem reconditis . . . est consecutus*.

¹*Brutus* 284: Atticum se, inquit, Calvus noster dici oratorem volebat . . . Dicebat, inquam, ita; sed et ipse errabat et alios etiam errare cogebat.

²For Asinius it is superfluous to adduce evidence (cf. Norden I, p. 261), except to note that the painstaking effort at purity, which characterized the school as a whole, is recognized in him by Quintilian x. 1. 113: *summa diligentia adeo ut quibusdam etiam nimia videatur*. For Messala it should also be superfluous, so clear is the evidence; but Teuffel (§ 222. 2) and others attach him rather to the Ciceronian tradition. His

To revert at length to our starting-point: The object of these introductory remarks has been to indicate just where and under what caption in Cicero's *De oratore* reference to the studies and activities of contemporary stylistic purists—whether they be called Atticists or not—is to be found. It is, as I have indicated, under the heading of *Latinitas*.

In book iii. 37, Crassus begins the task assigned him of setting forth the subject of style. It may be comprised, he says, under four points: *ut Latine, ut plane, ut ornate, ut apte dicamus*. Of these the first two are taken up together and treated as one aspect of the subject, in contrast to the remaining two. In this grouping of the matter Cicero follows older tradition, for in the *Auct. Ad Herennium* (iv. 12. 17) *Latinitas* and *explanatio* (= *ut Latine, ut plane*) form the two constituent elements of the superior heading *elegantia*,¹ a term which, with considerable amplification and widened range, corresponds to the ἐκλογή τῶν ὀνομάτων of Theophrastus'² analysis of the elements of style. That the attitude of Cicero toward these two points is depreciatory, as of something which has no proper place in rhetorical theory, is revealed at once:

Atque eorum quidem, quae duo prima dixi, rationem non arbitror expectari a me puri dilucidique sermonis, neque enim conamur docere eum dicere, qui loqui nesciat; nec sperare, qui Latine non possit, hunc ornate esse dicturum; neque vero, qui non dicat quod intellegamus, hunc posse quod admiremur dicere. Linquamus igitur haec, quae cognitionem habent facilem, usum necessarium. Nam alterum traditur litteris doctrinaeque puerili, alterum adhibetur ob eam causam, ut intellegatur quid quisque dicat, quod videmus ita esse necessarium, ut tamen eo minus nihil esse possit (iii. 38).

grammatical studies and extreme purism are attested by various references, of which the most general and significant is the characterization of Sen. *Rhet. Contr.* ii. 12. 8: *Latini sermonis* (= *Latinitatis*) *observator diligentissimus*. (The phrase is curiously misinterpreted by Norden I, p. 184 as referring merely to his avoidance of Greek words.) The superior purity of his diction to that of Cicero is alluded to by Tacitus *Dial.* 18: *in verbis magis elaboratus*. The Attic ἀφελεια of his style is recorded by Quint. x. 5. 2. The standpoint of Horace in the practice of his earlier writing is sufficiently obvious. Direct utterances too which proclaim his theoretical standpoint are not wanting, especially in *Serm.* book i, but they require interpretation, which must be reserved for another time. The position of Virgil is implied in the words of *Catalepta* 7: *Ite hinc, inanes, ite, rhetorum ampullae | inflata rore non Achaico verba*.

¹ *Elegantia* est quae facit ut <locus> unus quisque pure et aperte dici videatur.

² See Dionys. *De Isoc.* 3.

The polemical point of Cicero's condescending words lies in the fact that the study to attain a faultless Latinity constituted the largest part of the stylistic doctrine of the contemporary school of grammatical purists, whose efforts were directed toward a subtle mastery of that conversational idiom (*loqui*), which is here dismissed as merely preliminary to the attainment of oratorical utterance (*dicere*).

But although Cicero handles these two topics in the form of a *praeteritio*, with a certain arrogance as of one holding a superior position, yet, since he was familiar with the points of view of the grammatical schools, he has preserved not a little which contributes to our understanding of these studies. So for example, apart from their characteristic neglect of rhetorical utterance to which allusion has been made, we get their point of view relative to the early language as affording a norm of usage uncorrupted by rhetorical elaboration (39), their traditions of purity which were traced back to Laelius and the Scipionic circle (45), the designation of Plautus and Naevius¹ as types of the flawless Latinity of the forefathers (45), the imitation or affectation of antiquity as a means of attaining to a more perfect speech (42). It is not my purpose to analyze the contents of this chapter, further at any rate than may be necessary to see and to understand Cicero's attitude toward the subject. This attitude may be stated briefly as, (1) a consistent depreciation of the relative significance of these studies as a whole (in comparison with the rhetorical elaboration of language), and—granting the importance of a pure Latinity—(2) an effort to minimize the value of grammatical theory, in comparison with purely empirical means to this end, viz.: the hearing of good speakers who have preserved the tradition of the older usage, and the reading of the books of early writers. As a result, the acquisition of a pure Latinity, so far from being a matter of difficult study or art, or an attainment of conspicuous praise, is easy, natural, and a thing which

¹ An indication of the age of such criticism is afforded by the well-known dictum of Aelius Stilo: Musas Plautino sermone locuturas fuisse, si *Latine loqui* vellent. To this time (ca. 100 B. C.) may also belong the epitaph of Naevius which concludes: Itaque postquam est Orchis traditus thesauro, | obliti sunt Romae loquier lingua Latina (Gell. i. 24).

should be the characteristic possession, not of the trained orator, but of the good citizen. These points of view appear repeatedly, and I will cite some of the characteristic utterances in which they are contained:

Sed omnis loquendi elegantia, quamquam expolitur scientia litterarum [= *γραμματική*], tamen augetur legendis oratoribus et poetis; sunt enim illi veteres, qui ornare nondum poterant ea quae dicebant, omnes prope praeclare locuti; quorum sermone adsueta qui erunt, ne cupientes quidem poterunt loqui nisi Latine (39).

For the simplicity and elementary character of the matter, and the ease with which it may be acquired, see the concluding words of 38, cited above, and compare further the following passages from the *Brutus*, which may be introduced here in further illustration of Cicero's position:

ipsum Latine loqui est illud quidem, ut paulo ante dixi, in magna laude ponendum, sed non tam sua sponte [the position of the grammatical purists] quam quod est a plerisque neglectum: non enim tam praeclarum est scire Latine quam turpe nescire, neque tam id mihi oratoris boni quam civis Romani proprium videtur. (*Brutus* 140, said in reply to the criticisms passed upon the purity of the language of Antonius.)

Ad hanc elegantiam verborum Latinorum, quae etiam si orator non sis et sis ingenuus civis Romanus tamen necessaria est, adiungit illa oratoria ornamenta dicendi, etc. (*Brutus* 261).

One of the things most admired in a pure Latinity is a certain elegance and subtlety of pronunciation characteristic of the city of Rome—*urbanitas*, just as there is a characteristic flavor of Attic pronunciation which sets it off from the usage of the rest of Greece. But this is in no sense a matter of study or theory, but merely one of observation and birthright (42 extr. and 43).¹ Cicero does not, to be sure, entirely ignore the value of theoretical study, but as we saw, in the passage iii. 39 above, he subordinates it to the empirical considerations referred to, and so also in 48 he allows a place to the *subtilior cognitio ac ratio litterarum*, along with the *consuetudo sermonis cotidiani ac domestici* and the *lectio veterum oratorum et poetarum*. But concerning his general attitude of depreciation there can be no doubt.

Again, the second quality of style, clearness—*ut plane*

¹Cf. also *De officiis* i. 133.

dicamus—is treated in a similar cursory fashion, as something so easy that it may be passed over without serious discussion: *tam facilis est tota res*, etc. (49). Finally, in concluding the treatment of the two first qualities of style, Latinity and clearness, and passing over to the rhetorical *ornatus*, the attitude of Cicero is revealed in a parting shot:

Faciles, inquit, Antoni, partes eae fuerunt duae, quas modo percucurri vel potius paene praeterii, Latine loquendi planeque dicendi (52).

Over against these he arrays the magnitude, intricacy, variety, and difficulty of the truly oratorical functions:

Reliquae sunt magnae, implicatae, variae, graves, quibus omnis admiratio ingeni, omnis laus eloquentiae continetur; nemo enim unquam est oratorem, quod Latine loqueretur, admiratus; si est aliter, inident, neque eum oratorem tantum modo, sed hominem non putant (52).

It is clear, I think, that Cicero speaks almost contemptuously, certainly slightly, of that goal of effort, to the attainment of which the contemporary purists were bending all the efforts of their elaborate grammatical and literary studies. Against their grammar, with its worship of correctness and purity, he arrays the ancient mistress of emotional speech, rhetoric; and as grammar was the offshoot of philosophy, so too she had fallen the natural heir to the ancient feud of philosophy with rhetoric.¹

To sum up briefly our survey of this portion of the *De oratore*, let us note that Cicero has emphasized especially the elementary, easy character of these first two qualities of style. He has further urged that they make small requirements upon theory and doctrine for their attainment; the *consuetudo* of good speakers will accomplish all that is required. In further reinforcement of this point of view I would cite finally a later passage of the third book concerning the use of *verba propria*, that is, the ordinary non-figurative words for the designation of objects, a class of words which were thought of as falling especially within the territory of *Latinitas*.²

¹ Cicero's position is not of course an isolated one; its connection with the general hostility of rhetoric toward the claims of grammar may be seen by comparing Quint. i. 4. 5: quo minus sunt ferendi qui hanc artem ut *tenuem* atque *ieiunam* cavillantur.

² ἀκυρολογία (*improprietas*) is one of the three cardinal sins against Ἐλλητισμός.

Sed in hoc verborum genere propriorum dilectus est habendus quidam atque is aurium quodam iudicio ponderandus est; in quo *consuetudo* etiam bene loquendi valet plurimum. Itaque hoc, quod vulgo de oratoribus ab imperitis dici solet 'bonis hic verbis,' aut 'aliquis non bonis utitur,' *non arte aliqua* perpenditur, sed quodam quasi naturali sensu iudicatur; in quo non magna laus est vitare vitium, quamquam est magnum (iii. 150).

In this passage, apart from the direct statement that usage is of more service than art for the choice of such words, I would call attention to the criticism of the large claims of the grammarians which is contained in the words *in quo non magna laus est vitare vitium*; for the Stoic definition of Ἑλληνισμός is φράσις ἀδιάπτωτος, to which corresponds the definition of *Latinitas* as *sermo ab omni vitio remotus*. To such definitions, and the elevation of them to standards of style, Cicero's criticism looks.¹ And, indeed, with the pure conversational idiom as the goal of effort, it will be understood how excellence could not rise above irreproachable correctness. Taking advantage therefore of such an acknowledged position, Cicero urges that there is no merit in the avoidance of faults of speech; or, as he says elsewhere, pure Latin is not so much the characteristic mark of a good orator as of a free-born Roman citizen. In short, the precepts of *Latinitas* only afford the foundations; the true creation of art and theory is the superstructure which the orator shall rear upon them.

Verum tamen hoc quasi solum quoddam atque fundamentum est, verborum usus et copia bonorum. Sed quid ipse aedificet orator et in quo adiungat artem, id esse nobis quaerendum atque explicandum videtur (iii. 150).

We have here the same antitheses, colored with the same polemical implications as before, between the simple and easy acquisition of a pure Latinity, and the laborious, artistic task of oratorical embellishment. Many other utterances of a like character can be adduced both from the *Brutus* and the *Orator*, some of which would reveal even more sharply the hostile attitude of Cicero toward the standpoint of the grammatical purists; but for the present enough, I think, has been presented to make the

¹ Cf. Quint. viii. 1, 2, cited above, p. 103, note 2, and the definition of the goal of grammar there cited.

general relationships clear. I have touched also, in passing, upon the elaborate pains which were and had been devoted to the attainment of purity and correctness of speech by a stylistic school at Rome which had long been arrayed against the rhetoricians.

Concerning Caesar's treatise *De analogia* the information which has come down to us is very meager. Our earliest and most important source, the *Brutus*, yields us an instructive paraphrase of the title, and the fact (confirmed by other sources) that it was addressed to Cicero. Next in importance is the brief item of Suetonius (*Iul.* 56): *reliquit et de analogia duos libros (quos) in transitu Alpium, cum ex citeriore Gallia conventibus peractis ad exercitum rediret fecit*. This affords us a clue to the time of composition, and besides it suggests that the work can scarcely have been a systematic and deliberate treatise upon the subject. That it was in fact a controversial pamphlet, called forth by particular circumstances, as I shall endeavor to explain, deprives the statement of Suetonius of its paradoxical impressiveness,¹ and makes its composition entirely parallel to that of the *Anticato*, a partisan reply, written in camp on the eve of the battle of Munda.

The *De oratore*, as we learn from a letter of Cicero to Atticus (iv. 13. 2), was completed in November of the year 55 and declared ready for transcribing. It was therefore presumably in circulation in the early part of the year 54. It is well known that at this time Caesar was bent on gaining the active good-will and support of Cicero, an attitude which soon was met with reciprocal advances on Cicero's part.² It is not unlikely that Cicero himself would have forwarded a copy to Caesar at his winter headquarters in Cisalpine Gaul, or perhaps more probably one may conjecture that either Trebatius in April, or Quintus Cicero in May, of the year 54 may have been the bearer of a copy destined for

¹ Fronto (*Ad M. Aurelium*), p. 221: quod te vix quicquam nisi raptim et furtim legere posse prae curis praesentibus scripsisti, fac memineris et cum animo tuo cogites, C. Caesarem atrocissimo bello Gallico cum alia multa militaria, tum etiam duos de analogia libros scrupulosissimos scripsisse: inter tela volantia de nominibus declinandis, de verborum aspirationibus et rationibus inter classica et tubas.

² Cf. Drumann Vol. III, p. 318 and references. *Ad Quint. frat.* ii. 13 (15a). 2.

Caesar.¹ But conjecture is idle, and it suffices to know that in one way or another a copy would have come into Caesar's hands before leaving his Cisalpine quarters for the summer campaign, which he did in May of the year 54. With what feelings and judgments he may have read the work as a whole we are not here concerned; but as regards Cicero's depreciatory and condescending treatment of the significance for the orator of the first quality of style, *ut Latine dicamus*, it has been made clear that it must have been a challenge to the literary and stylistic ideals in which Caesar had been reared, and which in his own work he was endeavoring to realize.

The subject was not, of course, new to him. The usage of a pure colloquial idiom was traditional in his family,² and we learn from Suetonius that in his youth he modeled his oratorical style upon that of his uncle Julius Caesar Strabo,³ a man famous not only for his wit, his urbanity, and his charm of speech, but also for a conversational style and manner which was more effective than the rhetorical vehemence of other orators.⁴ Caesar Strabo was a student of the niceties of Latinity, and Marius Victorinus (*G. L.* vi. 8. 9) reports innovations in pronunciation and orthography dating from him, which are ground for believing that he participated in the theoretical studies of his brother,⁵ Q. Lutatius

¹ That Quintus was in communication with Caesar concerning the literary work of Cicero appears from ii. 13 (*Ad Quint. frat.*). 2: quoniam tu scribis poema ab eo nostrum probari. From ii. 15 (16). 5 we learn that Caesar himself had communicated with Cicero concerning this work. The first book he admired: reliqua ad quendam locum *βαθυμύτρεα*, hoc enim utitur verbo. Cicero begs his brother to tell him whether the subject-matter (*res*) or the style (*χαρακτήρ*) displeased Caesar. It is idle for us to try to decide a point concerning which Cicero himself was not clear, but it may be worth while to observe that Caesar's criticism *βαθυμύτρεα* is singularly like the criticism of Cicero's style which Calvus and Brutus communicated to him in letters. Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 18 extr.: Ciceronem a Calvo quidem male audisse tamquam *solutum et enervem*, a Bruto autem, ut ipsius verbis utar, tamquam *fractum atque elumbem*.

² *Brutus* 252.

³ Sueton. *Iul.* 55: genus eloquentiae dumtaxat adulescens adhuc Strabonis Caesaris secutus videtur.

⁴ Cf. *Brutus* 177 and *De officiis* i. 133: sale vero et facetiis Caesar, Catuli patris frater, vicit omnes, ut in ipso illo forensi genere dicendi *contentiones* aliorum *sermone* vinceret.

⁵ Frater uterinus. The Catuli, father and son, enjoyed a unique reputation for the purity of their speech: ei autem optime uti lingua Latina putabantur (*De offic.* i. 133). Cf. *Brutus* 132: incorrupta quaedam Latini sermonis integritas, and *De or.* iii. 29: (cuius oratio) est pura sic, ut Latine loqui paene solus videatur. Cf. Büttner *Porcius Licinus*, p. 166, for the grammatical studies of Caesar Strabo.

Catulus, the most eminent purist of his time, and that he endeavored in his own practice to carry them into effect. The early grammatical and rhetorical training of Caesar was under the direction of the grammarian M. Antonius Gniphō, a native of Gaul, educated at Alexandria,¹ through whom presumably Caesar was imbued with the Alexandrine doctrine of analogy in grammar. This point of view was, it seems certain, the animating principle of Gniphō's work *De Latino sermone*,² of which a fragment preserved by Quintilian illustrates an analogical innovation in forms like *ebura*, *robura*, *marmura*, instead of *ebora*, etc.³ We see therefore some of the influences which disposed Caesar to set a high value on the literary significance of simple, conversational style, and furthermore to believe that grammatical theory was an important instrument for the attainment of a pure Latinity. A portion of his argument in support of this latter contention still survives, as will appear presently.

But it may be said that I attach undue importance to Cicero's brief treatment of *Latinitas*; that, with an eye for the tree rather than for the forest, I have exalted to undue significance a small section, which is indeed but an inconsiderable part of the whole. It should be said however that, while it is true that Cicero's depreciation of the large claims that were made for the theoretical study of Latinity occupies but a small space in the *De oratore*, yet the importance of this part must not be judged only by what is said of it positively, but also by what is implied concerning it negatively. For, as we have seen, Cicero contrasts with the simple and elementary character of the claims of *Latinitas* the really great and characteristically oratorical qualities of style, *copia* and *ornatus*. It is not an exaggeration to say that in these we have the main theme of the whole work—the resources by which a large and abundant and embellished style, based upon a comprehensive knowledge of things, is to be

¹ Suet. *De gram.* 7: M. Antonius Gniphō, ingenuus in Gallia natus . . . institutusque Alexandriae . . . docuit primum in Divi Iulii domo pueri adhuc . . . docuit autem et rhetoricam.

² Suet. *loc. cit.*: Scripsit multa . . . etsi Ateius Philologus duo tantum volumina de Latino sermone reliquisset eum tradit.

³ Quint. i. 6. 23.

obtained.¹ Oratorical *ornatus* represents the flower or product of all the wide studies which Cicero inculcates.

The depreciatory treatment of the theoretical study of Latinity was a challenge to Caesar's training and conviction, and he took up the gauntlet in behalf of himself and of his contemporaries of like interests and tastes. Fresh from the reading of the *De oratore*, he employed the enforced leisure of the tedious journey across the mountains in the composition of the *De analogia*—a defense of the literary significance of pure colloquial Latinity and of the theoretical studies which led to its attainment. The title *De analogia* may strike one perhaps as altogether too narrowly framed to allow us to think of it as an answer to Cicero, or as having been elicited by him. But let us see. Cicero had not denied the importance of pure Latin for the orator, but he had urged that it was an easy thing to master, and could be got best from the reading of good books and the hearing of pure speakers. Against this point of view Caesar arrays the importance and necessity of *theory*, and accordingly he chose as his title the doctrine which dominated the grammatical studies of his time, the criterion by which the fluctuating and uncertain in language should be reduced to law—analogy. The goal of all grammatical study was the determination of correct usage ('Ελληνισμός, *Latinitas*), and Cicero therefore, in later reference to the treatise (*Brutus* 253), paraphrases the technical title quite in accordance with Caesar's intention by the phrase *de ratione Latine loquendi*.

The work was dedicated to Cicero, not because such a dedication would afford Caesar a desired opportunity to flatter the orator with exaggerated compliments, but because its theme was a vindication of the points of view which Cicero had dismissed so slightly. The procedure was entirely analogous to Cicero's dedication of the two works in which he attacks the Atticists to Brutus, a partisan of the school attacked. The treatise was not a contribution to the literature of grammatical theory for its own sake, but had its origin rather in the bearing of grammatical studies upon the work of the orator. That is to say, it took as its

¹ *De or.* iii. 125: In hoc igitur tanto tam immensoque campo cum liceat oratori vagari libere . . . facile suppeditat omnis apparatus ornatusque dicendi; rerum enim copia verborum copiam gignit, etc.

starting-point Cicero's undervaluation of the significance of these studies, in comparison with the larger tasks of rhetorical elaboration of language. This is shown by the fragments which Cicero has incorporated in the *Brutus*, the first of which declares that the choice of words (which it was the function of grammar to control) is the source of eloquence:

Qui (sc. Caesar) etiam in maximis occupationibus ad te ipsum (sc. Ciceronem) . . . de ratione Latine loquendi accuratissime scripserit primoque in libro dixerit *verborum dilectum originem esse eloquentiae*.¹ (*Brutus* 253).

The longer fragment which follows (containing the well-known dedicatory compliment to Cicero, for which it is quoted) gives, in words of courteous protest, the claim which Caesar makes for a recognition of the earnest study of the conversational idiom side by side with the language of oratorical abundance. (That the words are a direct quotation from Caesar, Cicero assures us.)

Ac si ut cogitata praeclare eloqui possent, nonnulli studio et usu elaboraverunt (cuius te paene principem copiae atque inventorem bene de nomine ac dignitate populi Romani meritum esse existimare debemus), hunc facilem et cotidianum novisse sermonem num² pro relicto est habendum?

In these words there is contained, I believe, unmistakable allusion to the passages in the *De oratore* which we have examined. In the first place, oratorical utterance *cogitata praeclare eloqui* (where *eloqui* is chosen in technical contrast to *loqui*³), with its characteristic Ciceronian *copia*, is contrasted with the *sermo facilis et cotidianus*, just as in Cicero the oratorical *ornatus* and appropriateness are set over against the simple obviousness of the first two qualities of style, *ut Latine, ut plane dicamus*. Caesar

¹ It might be urged that Cicero has conceded this point in *De oratore* iii. 150 (cited above, p. 109); but how grudgingly, and with what difference of tone and emphasis! The spirit of Caesar's utterance is illustrated by the grammatical source which Quintilian reproduces in i. 4. 5: quo minus sunt ferendi, qui hanc artem (sc. grammaticam) ut tenuem ac ieiunam cavillantur: quae nisi oratoris futuri fundamenta fideliter iecit, quidquid superstruxeris corruet.

² I have accepted, with the more recent editors, Stangl, Martha, and Wilkins, the correction *num* for *nunc* as essential to express the obvious intention of the passage. Ernesti, Halm, and others have attained the same end by different remedies.

³ On the logical distinctions between *loqui*, *eloqui* (*dicere*), *proloqui*, etc., see Augustine *De dial.*, ch. 4: Mart Capella iv. 338; and Cic. *Orat.* 113.

accepts, with a touch of subtle irony, Cicero's reiterated characterization of this conversational idiom as easy—

quae cognitionem habent *facilem* (iii. 38)

tam *facilis* est tota res (49)

faciles partes eae fuerunt duae (52)—

but he asks nevertheless whether, though it be easy and of every day character, it can still be passed over so lightly as Cicero has urged—*num pro relicto est habendum*. The allusion to Cicero's words appears again from a comparison of such passages as these:

*linquamus*¹ igitur haec, etc. (38)

praetereamus igitur praecepta Latine loquendi, etc. (48)

partes eae, quas modo *percucurri* vel potius paene *praeterii* Latine loquendi planeque dicendi (52).

The answer of Caesar is of course implied in the form of the question, putting with urbane interrogation the denial which it is the object of his treatise to record and sustain.

To gather up briefly the convergent lines of evidence which point to the relationship that I assume to have existed between the two works: The date of the *De analogia* must for other reasons be placed very near to that of the *De oratore* (though no evidence fixing the date more exactly between the years 55–52 has hitherto been found); the work was addressed to Cicero and can not reasonably have ignored any recognized attitude on his part toward the questions involved; a divergence of opinion between the two men is implied in the whole form of the fragment contained in the *Brutus*; finally, specific allusion to Cicero's depreciatory attitude toward the theoretical study of the conversational idiom is seen to be contained in this fragment.

In view then of these considerations we shall be justified in concluding: (1) that the *De analogia* was elicited by certain utterances of Cicero's *De oratore*; (2) that it was written in the spring of the year 54² with the memory of Cicero's recent words

¹ The juxtaposition of Cicero's *linquamus* with Caesar's *pro relicto* must defend the latter phrase against the suspicion of corruption.

² The dates which have been assigned to the work are the year 55 (Schlitte *De C. Iul. Caesare grammatico* [Diss. Halle, 1865], p. 12) and the winter of 53/52 (Köchly-Rüstow *Einl. in das Bel. Gal.*, p. 91, n. 59 [cited by Schanz], a work which has not, however, been accessible to me). The year 55, with tentative suggestion of 54 as a possible date, is selected by Beck (*Plinii libri dubii sermonis* [Leipzig, 1894], p. xv), who seems to be the latest scholar to have touched upon the subject.

fresh in the writer's mind; (3) that it was apparently rather a controversial pamphlet than a systematic treatise.¹

The fragments of the *De analogia* have been collected by the editors of Caesar, by Lersch in his *Sprachphilosophie der Alten* I, p. 131, and by Schlitte in the monograph referred to in note 2 on p. 115. To these fragments I venture to suggest two important additions, both from an early period of our record.

I. We have seen above that Caesar accepts, though not without a touch of ironical reserve, Cicero's characterization of the pure colloquial idiom as easy and a thing of everyday usage. If that is so, why did it require a laborious knowledge of grammatical theory for its mastery? Cicero had held that it did not. It was therefore incumbent on Caesar to show reason why the study of grammatical theory was necessary. With what sort of arguments did Caesar sustain his claim of this necessity? They are contained, I suspect, without essential modification of point of view, in the argument which Cicero presents in *Brutus* 258 ff., though I imagine that Cicero has distorted the true relations in slight degree by the flattering suggestion that Caesar was the first to see the necessity of theory: that was a claim which Caesar would scarcely have made for himself.

Solum quidem, inquit ille (Atticus),² et quasi fundamentum oratoris vides, locutionem emendatam et Latinam, cuius penes quos laus adhuc fuit, non fuit rationis aut scientiae, sed quasi bonae consuetudinis. Mitto C. Laelium P. Scipionem: aetatis illius ista fuit laus tamquam innocentiae sic Latine loquendi—nec omnium tamen, nam illorum aequalis Caecilium et Pacuvium male locutos videmus—sed omnes tum fere, qui nec extra urbem hanc vixerant neque eos aliqua barbaries domestica infuscaverat, recte loquebantur. Sed hanc certe rem deteriorem vetustas fecit et Romae et in Graecia. Confluxerunt enim et Athenas et in hanc urbem multi inquinatae loquentes ex diversis locis.³

¹The only other considerable fragment of the work which has been preserved in original form reveals the interrogatory, controversial style of the treatise. Gellius xix. 8. 7: num tu harum rerum natura accidere arbitraris, etc. A conception of the general manner may perhaps be gained from the defense of analogy in Varro *L. L.* ix.

²It is to be noticed that this passage also is put into the mouth of Atticus.

³The progressive corruption and barbarization of Rome by the influx of foreigners is commented on in a similar manner by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, representing a standpoint of grammatical purism like that of Caesar. *Antiq. Rom.* i. 89: αὶ δὲ τῶν

Quo magis expurgandus est sermo et adhibenda tamquam obrussa ratio, quae mutari non potest, nec utendum pravissima consuetudinis regula.

The whole of 258 may therefore be looked upon as an argument drawn from the armory of Caesar, and while it may not be considered a verbatim fragment, yet in any comprehensive reconstruction of the *De analogia* it must claim a place, which has not been accorded to it. How ill the whole argument sits with the hotly urged opinions of Cicero, expressed both before (in the *De oratore*) and after (in the *Orator*) the writing of the *Brutus*, may be seen by a brief comparison. In the concluding words of this paragraph the necessity of an immutable criterion, namely *ratio*, is urged, and the utter fallibility of usage is vigorously proclaimed—*nec utendum pravissima consuetudinis regula*. But in the *De oratore* iii. 150, excellence in the choice of words and their forms is measured, not by rule, but by natural feeling and the verdict of the ear: *in quo consuetudo etiam bene loquendi valet plurimum*. The same defense of *consuetudo* against the results of grammatical theory is the underlying principle of what is said concerning *σύνθεσις* in *Orator* 150 ff. One phrase typical of many may serve for illustration: *nec vero reprehenderim "scripsere," . . . et "scripserunt" esse verius sentio, sed consuetudini auribus indulgenti libenter obsequor* (*Or.* 157).

Whether the Caesarian matter extends beyond section 258, it would be rash to affirm; it seems to me, however, not unlikely that the illustrative matter which follows (to 261) may in part

βαρβάρων ἐπιμιξίαι, δι' ἃ ἡ πόλις πολλὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἀπέμαθε, σὺν χρόνῳ ἐγένοντο. καὶ θαῦμα τοῦτο ἂν εἶναι δόξειε τὰ εἰκότα λογισαμένοις, πῶς οὐχ ἅπας' ἐξεβαρβάρωθη, Ὅπικοις θ' ὑποδεξαμένη καὶ Μαρσούς καὶ Σαυιτάς καὶ Τυρρηνοὺς καὶ Βρεττιοὺς, Ὀμβρικῶν τε καὶ Λιγύων καὶ Ἰσθέρων [καὶ Κελτῶν] συχνὰς μυριάδας, ἅλλα τε πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἔθνη, τὰ μὲν ἐξ αὐτῆς Ἰταλίας, τὰ δ' ἐξ ἐτέρων ἀφικνύμενα τόπων μυρ' ὄσα, οὐθ' ὁμόγλωττα οὐθ' ὁμοδιὰτα, ὧν καὶ βίους σύγκλυδας ἀναταραχθέντας ἐκ τσαύτης διαφωνίας πολλὰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ κόσμου τῆς πόλεως νεοχμῶσαι εἰκὸς ἦν (cf. Norden *De Stilone Cosconio Varrone grammaticis* [Ind. Lect. Greifswald, 1895], p. ix). Dionysius conceives of the Latin language as having been originally an Aeolic dialect which has suffered corruption from so much foreign contamination: τοῦτο μόνον ἀπολαύσαντες ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν ἐπιμιξιών, τὸ μὴ πᾶσι τοῖς φθόγγοις ὀρθοεπεῖν (i. 90). It is clear that considerations of this sort were the reasons to which the grammarians both in Greece and Rome appealed in justification of their activity. It was the task of grammar to restore language (within practical limits) to its original purity, and analogy was one of the principles—and the dominating one—by which it sought to make good the defects of early record. Cf. also the important passage in *Fam.* ix. 15. 1 and *Brutus* 169 ff.

have been derived from Caesar, including the story of Sisenna's discomfiture at the hands of the facetious C. Rusius. Sisenna was an analogist,¹ and, like Caesar, aimed to restore the original purity of the language by rule,² but with the zeal of an evangelist of a new gospel he was extreme in its application and applied his *ratio* in frequent defiance of fixed *consuetudo*. It is, I should suspect, therefore Caesar's judgment which Cicero reports, *recte loqui putabat esse inusitate loqui* (260). Against such an earlier standpoint of grammatical *ratio*, which could only discredit it in the eyes of men of practical sense, Caesar raised his protest concerning the avoidance of all that was rare or unusual.³

II. The second fragment which I would restore to the *De analogia* is less extensive and less important. It is derived, too, from a different source, but the confirmation of its genuineness depends upon a portion of Cicero's narrative. It is contained in a quotation which the elder Pliny incorporates into an enthusiastic apostrophe to Cicero (*N. H.* vii. 117):

Salve primus omnium parens patriae appellate, primus in toga triumphum linguaeque lauream merite, et facundiae Latiarumque litterarum parens atque, ut dictator Caesar hostis quondam tuus de te scripsit, *omnium triumphorum laurea maior, quanto plus est ingenii Romani terminos in tantum promovisse quam imperii*.

It is obvious that Caesar in this somewhat fulsome praise alludes to the notorious verse of Cicero's poem *De consulatu suo*:

cedant arma togae, concedat laurea linguae.

He accepts Cicero's own estimate of himself (perhaps with an aside to his friends), and pays it back with interest—*omnium triumphorum laurea maior*. That was spreading it on pretty thick, and we may believe that Cicero looked with some appre-

¹ As we see from Varro, cited by Gellius ii. 25. 9. It is probable that the words of Cicero (*Brutus* 228), *doctus vir et optimis studiis deditus*, refer to his grammatical studies, and from the same passage we learn that he enjoyed the reputation of unimpeachable Latinity (*bene Latine loquens*), a judgment which is confirmed by Fronto, who places him among a group of authors *particulatim elegantis*, and by the citations of later grammarians. It should cause his soul unrest to know that the scholarship of our day assigns him to the Asiatic school (cf. Marx *Proleg. in Auct. ad Her.*, p. 140).

² Sisenna autem quasi emendator sermonis usitati cum esse vellet (*Brutus* 259).

³ The relationship of the injunction of Caesar to the practice of Sisenna is suggested also by Marx *loc. cit.* (n. 1, above), and by Reitzenstein *M. Terentius Varro*, etc. (Leipzig, 1901), p. 63.

hension upon flattery from another which interpreted the significance of his own figurative *laurea* with such glossatorial literalness. The praise was too strong to form a part of the direct quotation from Caesar which is made in the *Brutus*, but allusion to it and cautious restriction of its validity are found there:

hanc autem, inquit (Brutus), gloriam [viz., of being the *princeps* and *inventor* of oratorical abundance and embellishment at Rome] testimoniumque Caesaris tuae quidem supplicationi non, sed triumphis multorum antepono (255).

With these words, placed in the mouth of Brutus, Cicero prunes down the compliment of Caesar to a form tolerable for urbane acknowledgment: the extravagance of Caesar's *omnium triumphorum laurea maior* is reduced to a less invidious plane—*triumphis multorum antepono*. The whole of 255 ff. should be read in this connection, but the general considerations of the relative significance of oratorical (literary) and military values which are contained in the remaining laudatory words of Caesar—*quanto plus est ingenii Romani terminos in tantum promovisse quam imperii*—are reflected in the paragraph following, with a similar reduction of Caesar's extravagance of praise to a plane of acknowledged truth on which it can be accepted publicly without stultification:

Verum quidem si audire volumus, omissis illis divinis consiliis, quibus saepe constituta est imperatorum sapientia salus civitatis aut belli aut domi, multo magnus orator praestat minutis imperatoribus (256).

The fragment has not, of course, entirely escaped the vigilance of the editors of Caesar, but at some point in the progress of this phase of Caesarian scholarship, through some chance of allotment, it was assigned to the *Anticato*,¹ where it threatens to make good its title, if only by right of squatter sovereignty.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

EXCURSUS: A REFERENCE TO THE *De oratore* IN CAESAR'S *Anticato*

As a brief supplement to the foregoing, I would add here one other trace of contemporary allusion to the *De oratore*. Though it touches a different aspect of Cicero's argument and belongs to a later time, yet it affords welcome evidence of Caesar's acquaintance with the third book.

¹ Dinter iii, p. 135; Kübler iii. 2, p. 146.

In sections 52 ff. Crassus, instead of proceeding at once to a presentation of the technological aspects of rhetorical *ornatus*, digresses to a consideration of the real nature of eloquence. It is, he affirms, one of the supreme virtues, the function of which is to put into effect by persuasive speech the results of speculative thought and practical wisdom. And so it was conceived of by the early Greeks: *hanc cogitandi pronuntiandiue rationem vimque dicendi veteres Graeci sapientiam nominabant* (56). But, under the influence of Socrates' criticisms, philosophy was detached from this original unity with much detriment to itself as well as to eloquence. To be sure a certain tendency toward specialization of activity had foreshadowed this differentiation, so that Pythagoras, Democritus, and Anaxagoras were primarily thinkers, Themistocles, Pericles, and Theramenes were first of all statesmen, while Gorgias, Thrasyarchus, and Isocrates were chiefly teachers. But all conceived of the range of their activity in this broad and comprehensive spirit as an undivided unit. Even Socrates, though the inaugurator of the unhappy divorce of this ideal unity, was himself a product of the larger conception and a type of the power and versatility which it conveyed.

The goal therefore, to which Crassus exhorts his listeners, is the realization of this older ideal (71 ff.), which should incorporate—whether under the name of eloquence or philosophy (142)—all of these activities in a single person. Of the examples cited from the pre-Socratic period it is obvious that Themistocles, Pericles, and Theramenes might be said to embody the conception most perfectly; for Pythagoras, Democritus, and Anaxagoras tended too obviously toward the exclusive pursuit of philosophy, while Gorgias, Thrasyarchus, and Isocrates would suggest the one-sided study of eloquence.

We have seen above how Caesar in paying compliment to Cicero took as his starting-point the suggestion which Cicero himself afforded. It will be apparent how in similar manner, in relation to the argument of the *De oratore*, a compliment to Cicero might be framed, by the suggestion that in his own talents and career he exemplified the union of wise statesmanship and eloquence, which he had himself set up as an ideal. It is in this sense, I think, that we are to understand the words of Caesar to which Plutarch alludes (*Cic.* 39): *ἐκ δὲ τούτου διετέλει (Καῖσαρ) τιμῶν καὶ φιλοφρονούμενος, ὥστε καὶ γράψαντι λόγον ἐγκώμιον Κάτωνος ἀντιγράφων τὸν τε λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν βίον ὡς μάλιστα τῷ Περικλέους εὐκότα καὶ Θηραμένους ἐπαινεῖν.*